

This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

C O N F I D E N T I A L BRUSSELS 003983

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR EUR/ERA, NEA/I, S/P FOR DIRECTOR REISS

E.O. 12958: DECL: 09/17/2009

TAGS: [PREL](#) [EAID](#) [MOPS](#) [IZ](#) [EUN](#) [USEU](#) [BRUSSELS](#)

SUBJECT: EU MEMBER STATE CONTRIBUTIONS FOR UNPROFOR IRAQ:
10 MILLION EUROS SO FAR

REF: A. PM/GRESS-USEU/LITZENBERGER EMAIL 09/15/2004

[1](#)B. EUR/SAARNIO-USEU/LITZENBERGER EMAIL 09/16/2004

Classified By: USEU POLOFF Lee Litzenberger; reasons 1.4 (b,d)

[1](#)1. (C) According to a Council Secretariat official (protect) working on Iraq issues, EU member states have offered to date a total of 10 million euros (\$12 million) to fund the UN Protection Force in Iraq. In addition, the UK has pledged to provide an unspecified monthly sum of money to ensure that the UNPROFOR will be funded. However, the EU is still not clear on what the funding requirement for UNPROFOR will be; apparently member states are hearing that while the total required is \$26 million, the UN in fact only has a shortfall of \$10 million (USEU passed the non-paper provided by PM ref A)

[1](#)2. (C) The current country-by-country breakout, according to our contact, follows below. Our source cautioned, however, that many pledges are oral and some are controversial within member state governments, and some countries have yet to respond, so the numbers are likely to change.

Czech Republic (oral pledge)	500,000 euros
Portugal (oral pledge)	500,000 euros
Finland (written pledge)	1,000,000 euros
Denmark (oral pledge)	500,000 euros
Germany (oral pledge)	5,000,000 euros
Sweden (written pledge)	1,500,000 euros
Netherlands* (written pledge)	1,000,000 euros

Total	10,000,000 euros

*Netherlands has also pledged to provide an additional 500,000 euros to UNSECOORD, which our contact understood was separate from the UNPROFOR mission.

We Note that the information provided to USEU above tracks generally with that provided to EUR/ERA (ref B) with the following differences:

-- Portugal is 500,000 euros vice 50,000; Denmark is 500,000 vice 2.0 million (apparently there's a dustup between MFA and MOD over who pays, and whether ODA can be spent for an UNPROFOR mission);
-- Germany stated all 5 million of its electoral assistance funds could be allocated to UNPROFOR.

[1](#)3. (C) Our contact confirmed that the Commission is, in fact, still looking at whether it can fund UNPROFOR. The Rome Treaty clearly prohibits funding military operations, but there is a way around this. Were Member States to authorize the Commission to provide "core funding" (non-earmarked funds) to the UN (or other international institutions, the UN would then be free to use those funds in any manner it wished. At present, member states have explicitly refrained from giving the Commission the flexibility to provide core funding to international institutions, and insists on earmarking all EC funds to such organizations. EC Relex Commissioner Chris Patten is reportedly sympathetic to using Commission funds to support UNPROFOR, but is upset with member states refusal to allow him the flexibility (through core funding) to do so. On the one hand, Patten wants to support the UN in Iraq; on the other hand, he's inclined to say "it's not legal" out of frustration with the member states. Bottom line, according to our source: Don't hold our breath for Commission funding, but keep up the pressure on member states to contribute to UNPROFOR.

Comment

[1](#)4. (C) Our impression here is that member states with troops in Iraq are not prepared to make significant contributions to UNPROFOR, but the other EU member states have not yet registered the urgency of providing the necessary funding to allow UNPROFOR to move forward. Department may wish to consider using the upcoming ministerial meeting with the EU in New

York to stress the
urgency of resolving these funding issues.

McKinley